



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/714,901	11/16/2000	Shinnosuke Fukuda	225-009960-US(PAR)	5058

7590

03/13/2003

Clarence A. Green
PERMAN & GREEN, LLP
425 Post Road
Fairfield, CT 06430

EXAMINER

MONBLEAU, DAVIENNE N

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2828

DATE MAILED: 03/13/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/714,901

Applicant(s)

FUKUDA ET AL.

Examiner

Davienne Monbleau

Art Unit

2828

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 November 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Paul IP

PAUL IP
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11/16/00 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) Z.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

The IDS filed on 4/30/01 has been acknowledged and a signed copy of the PTO-1449 is attached herein.

Claim Objections

Regarding Claims 5 and 6, should "base member" be changed to "base members"?

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's cited prior art Tanaka et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,233,580) in view of Nakanishi et al. (U.S. Patent

Art Unit: 2828

No. 5,748,658). Regarding Claim 1, Tanaka et al. teach in Figure 2 a semiconductor module comprising a semiconductor laser element (5), a holding member (3) having a thermal conductivity and a base member (9) having a thermal conductivity. Tanaka et al. then teach in Figure 4 that said base member (9) may be attached to a mounting member (20) and further teaches in column 5 lines 45-56 that said mounting member may be an optical pick up casing. Lastly, Tanaka et al. teach in column 6 lines 60-66 accurately positioning said laser diode in said case with respect to optical components. Tanaka et al. do not teach a thermal adhesive. Nakanishi et al. teach in column 10 lines 30-35 using a thermal adhesive to mount elements. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a thermal adhesive in Tanaka et al., as taught by Nakanishi et al., to remove heat from the semiconductor laser chip and maintaining it in a state close to room temperature so that reliability may be greatly enhanced. (See Nakanishi et al. column 10 lines 33-36).

Regarding Claim 2, Tanaka et al. teach in Figure 4 that part of the base member (9) is exposed to the outside of the case (20).

Regarding Claim 3, Tanaka et al. do not teach the thermal conductivity of said case (20), but teach in column 3 lines 63-64 that said base member (9) has a high heat conductivity. Therefore, it is implied that said thermal conductivity of the base member (9) is great than that of the case (20).

Regarding Claims 4-6, see Claims 1-3 respectively. It is known in the art that optical pickup assemblies may comprise more than one laser.

Regarding Claims 7-9, the method of a device is not germane to the issue of patentability of the device itself, since the device itself obviously uses the method. Therefore the rejection used on the device applies also to the method of the device.

Regarding Claims 10-12, the method of a device is not germane to the issue of patentability of the device itself, since the device itself obviously uses the method. Therefore the rejection used on the device applies also to the method of the device. Furthermore, it is known in the art that optical pickup assemblies may comprise more than one laser.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Momeni (U.S. Patent No. 6,394,158) teaches in the abstract a method for thermally bonding substrates. Gaebe et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,113,404) teach in Figure 2 an optical subassembly comprising a laser (40), a holding member (30), a case (11) and base member. Ohyama (U.S. Patent No. 5,689,108) teaches in Figure 4 an optical pick-up assembly comprising a laser (134), a holder (132), a base member (130), and a main base (141).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Davienne Monbleau whose telephone number is 703-306-5803. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:00 am to 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Paul Ip can be reached on 703-308-3098. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-7722 for regular communications and 703-308-7722 for After Final communications.

Application/Control Number: 09/714,901

Page 5

Art Unit: 2828

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.

Danielle Menblau

DNM

March 3, 2003

Paul IP

PAUL IP
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800